11160

A SERMON PREACHED IN the Cathedrall Church of *Yorke*, *the first Sunday in Lent*, ANNO DOMINI, 1607.

By THOMAS DODSON, M. *of Arts.*

WHEREVNTO IS ANnexed by the sayd *T. D.* a Replication *to a Popish Answere, written in de*fence of Communion vnder one kind.

EPHES. chap. 4. verse 14.15.

Let vs henceforth be no more children, wauering and caried about with euery wind of doctrine, by the deceit of men, and with craftinesse whereby they lay in waite to deceiue vs. But, &c.

AT LONDON,
Printed by H. L. for *Mathew Lownes*, and are to be sold at his shop in *Paules* Church-yard, at the signe of the Bishops-head. 1610.

NOT TO BE REPRODUCED WITHOUT PERMISSION

6990a

TO HIS SISTER IN LAW

Mistresse MARGARET KILLINGBECKE, *as also to the indifferent iudgement of all reasonable Readers.*

HAuing at the length (louing Sister) and after long expectation receiued by your meanes a written answere (fuller of lyes and falsities than lines) to my printed Sermon against Popish Transubstantiation, and their Communion vnder one kinde (wherein a Romish Spider hath spunne a faire thread, euen a plaine Cob-webbe to snare weake simple flies) I was purposed, if two Recusants had thereunto subscribed according to promise, to haue committed it with a Replication thereunto, to the worlds consideration: but suspecting the condition of English Romanists, I feared without warrantie so farre to proceede, least after the discouering of his grosse errours, and foule absurdities, I should most vniustly be accused (by that so froward a generation) of forgerie and falshood. Leauing therefore his idle and senseleſſe discourse, touching Popish Transubstantiation, to be printed (if it may abide examination) at his owne appointment, I will now vpon your word onely (to the ende especially that a scantling thereof in the meane time may bee taken) bend my best forces to discouer in part his shameleſſe shifts, for and concerning their Communion vnder one kinde. Wherein marke, consider, and beholde life and death, trueth and errour, wholesome food and noysome poyson, to bee sette before you: yea, iudge your selfe (poore mis-led Sister) I pray you, and iudge vprightly, what great blindneſſe it is, or rather wilfull madneſſe, that your silly soule should suffer it selfe thus grossely to bee defrauded of it selfe, and of glorie. Many can write to you with more profoundneſſe; none with more sincere feruencie, and desire to saue you. Yea, as I haue trauelled in birth again and again, that you might bee moulded for a better life, and that Christ Iesus might be formed in you: so, I cannot but still goe forward in the same course, with vnwearied diligence, expecting onely for my paines to gaine a blessing to my selfe in the saluation of your soule. Which if I compasse, I shall account it a great fruit of my labour: if not, I shall not thinke I haue laboured in vaine, seeing I assayed, and endeauored to haue profited. For, as Saint *Cyprian* speaketh, *Deus non æstimat quenquam ex euentu rerum, sed ex affectu*: Not the fruite of their labours, but the affection of mens hearts, gets them respect with

God. Awake therefore, in Iesus Christ, being thus admonished, awake. Yea, if there bee any care left in you of that soule which you haue prostituted to errour, or if you haue any regard to that God, whose simple truth you haue forsaken, returne then, (O returne, deare Sister) returne and saue one, returne to God, returne to his truth, returne to his Church; your blood be vpon my head if you perish. But otherwise, leading your dayes in Popish blindnesse, you may die in your sinnes: yea confusion, shame, and condemnation shall be your portion for euer, if you still haue pleasure in your owne wilfulnesse, and do not giue your heart to receiue, to beleeue, and to loue the truth. Well: hoping the best, and wishing the best, I rest alwaies readie (according to the small measure of my endowments) to supplant errour, especially to examine and sift at this time the Papisticall leauen, and superstitious Doctrine of such a nameless and shameless Aduersarie, as boasting in all brauerie before the victorie, was able to shew no valour in the battell. For many of my arguments and testimonies, which apposed him, hee hath not onely passed in silence, but those also which hee presumed to encounter, hee hath so weakely assau'ted, as that I referre his weake and silly poore shifts to your dayly meditation: beseeching the God of all grace and mercie to create a new heart, and so to renue a right spirit within you, as that you may see and flye that which is false with detestation; that you may see and follow that which is true, with acceptation; and that you may be vpright and continue in it, vnto saluation.

Your Brother, in all Christian affection,

Tho: Dodson.

6990a

TO THE REVEREND AND VVORſhipfull Gentlewoman, Miſtreſſe CATHERINE FOVVBERIE Widdowe, his verie louing Mother in Law, health and true happineſſe in this life, and in the life to come, through Ieſus Chriſt.

Before I could be reſolued (Right Chriſtian, and moſt deare Mother) to handle this Text, I was driuen into a doubtfull meditation, by reaſon of a double conſideration. For conſidering that I was to ſpeake before great men, in a great Auditorie: I doubted, whether it ſhould bee more expedient, to teach from this Text non-communicants *to forſake their former errours, and to renounce their ſuperſtitious vanities; or to inuite from another Text all in generall to a Lents Potation. Whereof thus muſing and meditating, I became in the end reſolued, to make choice of this Text rather, not onely in regard that the feaſt of Eaſter draweth neere: but in reſpect eſpecially, that ſome euen* ex

meis intimis, *otherwise vertuously inclined, are not rightly resolued how to eate the Lords Bread at the Lords Table, and to drink of his Cup. Concerning whose wilfull blindnes, and blind wilfulnes, sparing to speake I sigh to see, and rew to knowe, what I fully knowe: onely I protest before God, calling in this Sermon both the holie Scriptures, and holy Fathers to witnesse, that either there is no truth, or else that the points of Poperie (which* non-communicants, *like halting hypocrites, now embrace) are most false. Which rude Sermon and simple, but such as it is, vpon the assurance of your knowne courtesie, and to the end especially that a scantling heereby of that religion, which once (O happie conuersiõ!) you professed, may be taken; I now offer in way of thankefulnesse for vndeserued kindnesses, and in token of great gratitude due vnto your Worship. Accept therefore (right vertuous & euer kind Mother) I humbly beseech you this poore present, and present exercise, as a poore sparke of great good will: wherein if any good thing be found, giue God (I pray you) the glorie; if any fault, impute it vnto me: and pray vnto God, that either I neuer speake, or else speake to his glorie. Thus beseeching the God of all grace, the Author, and giuer of all good gifts, to grant vnto your Worship increase of spirituall graces, and continuance of bodily health, with wealth and welfare in this life present and in the life to come euerlasting blessednesse; I leaue you, and your meditation vpon this Sermon, to the guidance & gratious assistance of the Almightie: whom I beseech so to blesse you in reading, as that being throughly resolued, how to receiue Christs holy Mysteries, you may stedfastly stand in the right profession of Christian religion,*

6990a

ligion, and euer wiſh the proſperitie of them that loue it, and labour for it: which the Lord in mercie grant vnto euerie Chriſtian ſubiect. Goodmaudam *in* Yorkeſhire, *this laſt of March,* 1608.

By him that is vnworthie of your
motherly fauour, yet deuoted
to honour you,

Thomas Dodſon.

To the Reader.

CHriſtian Reader, I haue here ſet down (ſo neere as I could remember) whatſoeuer was ſpoken in deliuering this Sermon: yea, and more matter then the time ſuffered; but not more then was purpoſed to bee vttered. For being graced beyond expectation with the gratious preſence of the moſt reuerend Father in God the Lord Archb. of *Yorke* his Grace, after his paines taken according to godlineſſe elſewhere in the Citie; I was in regard thereof rather contented abruptly to end, then to be troubleſome: whereupon partly, but eſpecially to profit ſuch abroad as hauing eares to heare, and ſoules to ſaue, do want inſtruction, I became reſolued to penne this my then exerciſe, and to put it into print. Now iudge not raſhly (gentle Reader) I moſt heartily deſire thee, in that I being the vnworthieſt of many hundreths, and the vnableſt of

many

6990a

many thouſands, haue taken vpon me to ſet forth, and to publiſh any thing, to the open light and ſight of the world: for wee knowe, that the poore Widdowes mite (where God is made Vmpire) ſhall not bee refuſed. And the Lord the ſearcher of the harts and reines, knoweth my purpoſe and affection in preaching and publiſhing this matter: wherein, if any thing be amiſſe (my amiſſe once diſcouered by the pen of the learned) *Peccaui* ſhal be my Plea: for *hæreticũ me eſſe nolo*. Thus I leaue thee, committing this my ſimple labour vnto the bleſſing of Gods holy ſpirit: who grant vs a right vnderſtanding heart, with a charitable friendly Iudgement in all things.

T. D.

6990a

MATH. 26. 26, 27.

Iesus tocke the bread, and when hee had blessed, hee brake it, and gaue it to the Disciples, and said, Take, eate, this is my Bodie. Also hee tooke the Cuppe, and when he had giuen thankes, hee gaue it to them, saying, Drinke ye all of it, &c.

IT is not mine intent (most Reuerend Father, Right Honourable, Right Worshipfull, and in the Lord beloued) to speake any thing at this time cõcerning the Author of this Sacrament of the Bodie & Bloud of Christ, concerning the time when it was ordained, concerning the ende why it was ordained, or concerning any other circumstãces hereunto belonging; but onely so farre forth, as the controuersie betweene vs and the Papistes shall leade mee. Which controuersie and dissention may not bee passed ouer without dili-

gent examination, and due consideration, considering that our aduersaries in their grosse and absurd opinion, rent with their teeth him that made them, and so dishonour him, whome they ought to honour. Now, all the reason that they build vpon, is but the wordes onely of the Institution. Christ saide, *This is my bodie: Ergo* say they, it is his Bodie. Whereunto I might answere, that by like argument they may proove as well that Christ is a Doore; because hee sayth *I am that doore:* or that hee is a naturall Vine; because hee sayth, *I am that true Vine.* But aunswering I do saie with Saint *Hierome*, *That the Gospell standeth not in the bare wordes of the Scriptures, but in the meaning*. As also aunswering, I do say with Saint *Augustine*, *that there is nothing spoken obscurely in one place of Scripture, which is not made plaine and verie cleare in some other:* And that therefore wee may not (like men factious rather then religious) bring our owne senses to the reading of the Scriptures; but wee are to take the sense that the Scripture giueth, by conferring one Scripture with another: for otherwise, to take a figuratiue speech properly and according to the letter, destroyeth the soule. Saint *Augustine* in his Booke *De doctrina Christiana*, giueth diuerse learned Lessons, whereby to knowe a figuratiue speech; one of which lessons is this: *If the Scripture seemeth to cõmand a wicked thing & vngodly, or to forbid a thing that charitie requireth, then knowe* (sayth hee) *that the speach is figuratiue*. According to which rule, and direction, Christ his wordes in the Institution of this Sacrament are to bee vnderstood

Iohn, 10, 9. & 15, 1.

figu-

figuratiuely: for, Christ commaunding at his last Supper to eate his Bodie and to drinke his Bloude, seemed to commaund in sound of wordes an inconuenience and a wicked thing. Yea, to say that the breade is Christes Bodie in proper speach and according to the letter, is horrible blasphemie: for if bread in proper speach bee the flesh of Christ, then bread is also the seed of *Dauid*: then bread was fastened to the Crosse for our sinnes: then breade was buried, rose the thirde day from death, and now sitteth in heauen at the right hand of GOD the Father: yea, if bread be Christ, then is bread the Son of God, and second person in the sacred Trinity. Nay, no question if bread bee truely and properly Christ according to a literall and carnall construction: then (besides these monstrous impieties, which cannot be auoyded) it must needes ensue, that really wee eate Christes flesh in the sacrament with our mouthes, & actually drinke his bloud with our lippes; which is a thing hainous and horrible in Christian religion & behauiour: yea, as S. *Augustine* auoucheth, *It is more horrible to eat mans flesh thē to kil it, and to drink mans bloud thē to shed it.* But some peraduenture obiecting will say, that Christ said, *My flesh is meate indeed, and my bloud is drink indeed.* Wherunto in answering, it behoueth to make a difference betweene the bodie of Christ and the Sacrament of his body, least wee bee deceiued, and take one for another. And therefore I do say with Saint *Augustine, that the Sacrament (of Christs body) is receiued of some vnto life, and of some vnto destruction: but the thing it selfe (that is, the flesh of Christ) whereof this is a Sacrament, is*

Blush at this yee Papistes.

Ioh. 6.

Note this difference. Tra. 26. In Ioh.

receiued of all men vnto life, and of no man to deſtruction; yea, his fleſh is ſo truely meate, and his blood is ſo truely drinke, as that whoſoeuer doubteth of this wee hold him accurſed: but, for what part of man (ſoule, or body) this meat was prouided, in this ſtãds the difference betweene vs and the Papiſtes. They ſay, for the body, no leſſe then for the ſoule: wee ſay for the ſoule, and not for the body: Now to make this point plaine on our ſide, and ſo to ende this controuerſie; if their mouthes bee not farre out of taſte, I will plainely proue by teſtimonies of the holie Scriptures, as alſo of the holy ancient Fathers, that Chriſt his fleſh and bloud is ſuſtenance not for the body, but onely for the ſoule. *Doe you not knowe* (ſayth Chriſt) *that whatſoeuer thing from without entreth into a man, cãnot defile him: becauſe it entreth not into his hart, but into the bellie.* Whereby it appeareth euen in the iudgement of our Sauiour, that nothing can enter both the heart and the bellie: but the fleſh of Chriſt entreth into the heart: *Ergo*, not into the bellie. Saint *Paul* likewiſe ſayeth, *Meates are ordained for the bellie, and the belly for meates; but God will deſtroy both it, and them*: but the body of Chriſt God will not deſtroy: it is therefore no meate for the belly. To bee ſhort, that which doth either defile or ſanctifie, is not meat for the belly: for *meates do not commend vs vnto God*, 1. Cor. 8. 8. But *Chriſt with his bloud doth ſanctifie*, Heb. 13, 12. *Ergo*, Chriſt his fleſh and bloud is not meate for the belly.

Mar. 7.

1. Cor. 6.

Other arguments to this effect, and to ſet foorth the truth hereof, I could vſe many: but let theſe and all

all other proofes bee voyde, if the learned auncient Fathers do not hereunto ſubſcribe, and euen conclude the verie ſame point. Saint *Chryſoſtome* ſayth, *Chriſt is the Bread, which feedeth not the bodie, but the ſoule, and filleth not the bellie, but the minde.* Chryſoſt. In Mat. 9.
Ambroſe, *Hee is not bodilie, but ghoſtly meate.*
Auguſtine, *It is not lawfull to deuoure Chriſt with teeth. Prepare not your Iawes, but your heartes.* Aug. de conſ. Diſt. 2.
And Saint *Cyprian* ſayth, *The bodie of Chriſt is* cibus mentis, non ventris, *is meate for the minde, not for the bellie:* not for the teeth to chewe, but for the ſoule to beleeue. Cypr. de. Cœna Dom.
The Teſtimonie of all which good and lawfull witneſſes; is ſufficient to remoue vs from the corporall eating of Chriſts fleſh with teeth and iawes. Indeede touching the viſible part of this Sacrament, as the bread and wine, which is ſeene with eyes, felt with hands, and bruſed with teeth, of that there is no doubt, but it entereth our mouthes and reſteth in our bowels: but to ſay, that the naturall fleſh of Chriſt entereth the mouth, or paſſeth downe the throat, or lodgeth in the Stomacke, is a poſition (as you haue heard) altogether repugnant both to the holie Scriptures, and holy Fathers. But our aduerſaries the Papiſtes being willing to preſſe the truth, though they cannot oppreſſe it, will peraduenture obiect and ſay, Chriſt is Almightie and can do all thinges; therefore being able to turne breade into his bodie at his laſt Supper, hee did it. A poſſibili ad eſſe, non valet conſequentia.
Whereunto I might replie, that GOD was able to make vs Swine, Sheepe, Oxen, Horſes, Frogges, Dogges, &c. yet hee hath not done ſo: But aunſwering, I do ſay, that though God

is able to do whatsoeuer he wil, yet he wil do none of those thinges that bee not in him of their owne nature. Sith then, that GOD is true of his owne nature, hee canne doe nothing, that is against his worde: not because that hee is not able to do it, but because his Power doth neuer ouertwharte and crosse his Will. Indeede hee is Almightie in working his will: but not in changing his nature; for that which hee will not, that hee doth not: and therefore to imagine what wee list, and then to father our falshoodes on Christes Almightie power, is errour, impietie, yea, insolent blasphemie. But passing ouer this Popish argument from *can* to *will*, whereupon no argument followeth: I will now plainely proue by the worde of trueth, and testimonie also of auncient Writers, that the bread in the Sacrament is not the substance, but a signe of Christes bodie: and that the nature of it remaineth (howsoeuer the popish sort iangle) after the wordes of consecration. Christ at his last Supper tooke nothing but breade, hee brake nothing but breade, hee gaue into the handes of his Disciples, to eate, nothing but breade, and (*as appeareth by my Text*) hee called nothing his body, but euen the same breade, which hee had taken, which he had broken, and which hee gaue vnto them. Now, in thus calling the breade his bodie, it was in mysterie and figure, not in nature and substance: and therefore it is but as if hee had sayde, This breade which I haue in my handes is a signe of my body which shortly after shall bee crucified, and deliuered

vnto

vnto death for your ſaluation. To which effect after this manner thus ſpeaketh Saint *Cyprian: Dedit dominus noſter in menſa, in qua vltimum cum Apoſtolis participauit conuiuium, &c.* Our Lord at the Table, whereat he receiued his laſt Supper with his Diſciples, gaue with his owne hands bread and wine: but vpon the Croſſe, he gaue his own body to be wounded by the hands of the ſouldiers. Where hee maketh a difference betweene that which Chriſt gaue vpon the Croſſe, and that which hee gaue at the Table: at the Table hee gaue bread and wine; vpon the Croſſe, hee gaue his bodie and bloud. Likewiſe elſe where, hee calleth the bread after conſecration, *Panem ex multorum granorum adunatione congeſtum.* Bread made of the ſubſtance, and moulding of many cornes. Wherunto Saint *Auguſtine* ſubſcribing, thus ſpeaketh in the perſon of Chriſt: *This body which you ſee, you ſhall not eate, neither ſhall you drinke the bloud which they that crucifie mee ſhall ſhedde: I haue commended a Sacrament vnto you, which ſpiritually vnderſtoode ſhall quicken you.* But to bee ſhort, Saint *Paule*, (who ſetteth foorth fully and moſt effectually both the doctrine and right vſe of the Lords Supper) is well worthie to decide this controuerſie, where diuers times in one piece of a Chapter after the wordes of conſecration hee repeates the word, Bread. In concluſion therefore it muſt needes followe and bee graunted, ſtriue the pieuiſh and peruerſe Papiſtes neuer ſo much againſt it, that the name of the thing ſignified is giuen in this place to the ſigne it ſelfe: which is a figure, not ſtraunge or newe;

Cypr. de vnctione Chriſmatis.

Aug in Pſal. 98.

1. Cor. 11.

but

635

but vsuall and common, where mention is made of Sacraments: for, the Lorde, speaking of *Circumcision*, calleth it the Couenant: yet circumcision is not the couenant, but a signe of the couenant. And the *Paschall Lambe* is called the Lords Passeouer, though it was not the Passeouer, but the signe of the Passeouer, & serued onely to put men in remembrance of that benefit; as it is afterward expounded: but leauing the holy scriptures, I will now proue the verie same point by the Authoritie of the holy Fathers. Saint *Augustine* in his booke of Questions vpon Leuiticus, hath these wordes: *Solet res quæ significat, eius rei nomine quam significat, nuncupari.* That is, The thing that doth signifie, is wont to bee called by the name of the thing that it doth signifie. And in the Epistle which hee wrote to *Bonifacius*: *Si enim Sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum, quarum Sacramenta sunt, non haberent, omnino Sacramenta non essent: ex hac autem similitudine, plerunque etiam ipsarum nomina accipiunt.* If the Sacraments (saith he) had not some certaine similitude of the things whereof they be Sacraments, they should be no Sacraments: and of this similitude, many times they haue the names of those thinges themselues. Whereunto *Theodoretus* agreeth, and speaking of Christ thus subscribeth: *Hee that did call his body wheate and bread, and himselfe a vine, doth honour the bread and wine with the name of his bodie, and bloud, not chaunging the Nature, but adding grace vnto the Nature.* And Saint *Chrysostome* hath the verie like wordes. Whereby it appeareth, and euen hereupon may rightly bee inferred, that the Romane transubstantiators haue no

Gen. 17.

Exod. 12.

Aug. super Lev. quæst. 57.

Idem ad Bonifacium. Epist. 23.

Theod. Dial. 1.

Chrysost. ad Cæsarium.

ground

ground of reaſon, to affirme that there is more tranſubſtantiation in the Supper, by chaunge of the ſubſtance of the ſignes, into the thing ſignified by the vertue of conſecration, then in all the other Sacraments. For if there were ſuch a change of ſubſtance, by the vertue of the Sacramentall wordes, and of the conſecration of the ſignes, it ſhould neceſſarily then come to paſſe, that the ſame ſhould bee in all Sacraments, and not more in the one, then in the other; forſomuch as there is none at all that may bee Sacraments without conſecration, and without Sacramentall words, and they haue all this common together, and the like reaſon is in them all, concerning this point. But to bee ſhort, and yet for more full contentation, & euen to giue ſatisfaction to the ſimpleſt here preſent, that the ſigne is called by the name of the thing ſignified, and that there is no mutation in the ſubſtance of it, but onely in the vſe; I do for further proofe in this behalfe, appeale to the outward ſenſes: as, to the eyes, noſe, mouth, taſte, hands, and euen to the reaſon of man, what it is, that wee doe receiue, when wee come at the feaſt of Eaſter, and at other times to the Lords Table. Whereunto in anſwering if theſe ſenſes iumpe and agree, that it is bread and wine conſecrated to a holy and heauenly vſe; they verilie ſpeake the truth and lye not: for there was neuer any tranſubſtantiation and conuerſion of one ſubſtance into another, but the outwarde ſenſes iudged it to be ſo. As for example, when the rodde was turned into a Serpent, the Iſraelites ſawe it: And when water was turned into wine at a Mariage, the gueſts ſaw it, and taſted it. But now in this Sacra-

Note well.

Exod. 4.

Ioh. 2. 8.

ment we do not see any such mutation: the bread being sanctified taketh not the forme of flesh, neither doth the wine appeare to be bloud; but, as signes, do remaine all one in quantitie and qualitie, without alteration of substance. Whereby (beloued) albeit it appeareth, as also by that which formerly hath beene deliuered, that our cõstruction concerning the words of the institution, is consonant & right agreeable not onely to learning and religion, but to common sense also and reason: yet vtterly to ouerthrowe the false doctrine of popish transubstantiation, and to put it out of doubt, that we eate not Christs bodie carnally as our aduersaries dreame and grossely imagine, I wil now ouerturne by force of arguments and sufficient reasons, the turning of the bread into the Body of Christ, and the wine into his bloud, though many as concerning this point (which yeelde from other points of superstition) do sticke, and are verie hard to be perswaded.

The first reasõ against transubstantion.

That the substance of bread remaineth in the Sacrament after the wordes of consecration, I will first proue it from the definition of a Sacrament. For the Fathers do affirme it to consist of an earthlie thing, and of an heauenly thing: of the Word, and of the Element. Now for the element and earthly thing to bee taken away by transubstantiation, is against, and euen vtterly destroyeth, the verie nature of a Sacrament. And therefore from the definition thereof wee are well taught and instructed, that the bread, which is the element and earthly thing, remaineth still in substance without alteration, as well after as before the consecration; according to this saying

August. Chrysost.

ing

ing of Saint *Auguſtine: The word commeth to the Element*, (he ſayth not, taketh away the Element) *and ſo it is made a Sacrament.*

Againe, in Baptiſme the ſubſtance of Water remaineth, though it hath wordes of conſecration, and is made a Sacrament of our Regeneration: and therefore in the Lords Supper, the bread and wine are not changed and done away vtterly: for the Scripture ſpeaketh as highly of the one as of the other. The ſecond reaſon.

Againe, if the Elements of bread and wine are conuerted into the verie Bodie and Bloude of Chriſt: then the verie reprobates, as *Iudas*, ſhould truely feede on the Bodie and Bloud of Chriſt, and ſo ſhould bee ſaued: but this is falſe, and flat againſt the Scripture; *Ergo*, there is not any ſuch conuerſion. The third reaſon.

Againe, if the Papiſtes receiue Chriſts bodie in the Sacrament, then they receiue either his mortall, or his immortall body. If they ſay, they receiue his mortall bodie: I might anſwere, that it cannot profitte them; becauſe mortall foode, is but for this mortall life: but I aunſwere, that CHRIST hath not a mortall Bodie to communicate vnto them; for it is now chaunged, and hath putte on immortalitie. If they ſay, they receiue his immortall, and glorified Bodie, then like men ſlaine with their owne ſwordes, they muſt flie from this their text, *Hoc eſt corpus meum*; becauſe at the time when CHRIST ſpake theſe wordes to his Diſciples hee had no glorified body: for the Sacrament was inſtituted before his death, The fourth reaſon.

639

and his body was not glorified vntill after his resurrection.

The fift reason. Againe, if the Papistes receiue the verie same bodie of Christ in the sacrament, which he had from the Virgine *Marie*, and which was on the Crosse; thē it must haue the same naturall properties of a Body which that had, as proportion of shape, distinction of partes, extention of quantitie, circumscription of place, and the verie same substance of flesh, which he tooke of his Mother *Marie*: for these properties had Christes Body, that hung on the Crosse: but the bread (which they say, is turned into Christs Body) is without these and such like properties of mans nature: *Ergo*, the bread is not turned really and substantially into the body of Christ which came from the Virgine *Marie*, and which was offered for vs on the Crosse.

Note here a great absurditie.

The seauenth reason. Againe, the breade in the Sacrament after the wordes of consecration is subiect to as many chaunges and chances as it was before: it may putrifie, and the wine may wax sharpe and turne into vinegar; yea, both of them may be mingled with ranke poyson: but the precious Body & Bloud of Christ cānot be mingled with poyson; but is an excellent counterpoyson against all infection of sinne whatsoeuer: the Bodie of Christ cannot putrifie, the bloud of Christ cannot become sharpe or sowre as the outwarde signes may: the substance therefore of bread & wine is not changed into the bodie and bloud of Christ, but remaineth still, after the wordes of consecration.

The eight reason. Againe, *Christ sitteth on the right hand of God*, (Hebrewes,

(Hebrewes, 1.) *and there ſhall remaine, touching his humanitie* (as Saint *Peter* teacheth) *vntill the time that all thinges bee reſtored which God hath ſpoken by his Prophets*, Acts, 3. *Ergo*, Chriſt is not bodily preſent in the Sacrament: for it is againſt the nature of a natural body to be in moe places then one at once. And therefore ſaid Saint *Auguſtine*: *Corpus domini in quo reſurrexit, in vno loco eſſe oportet; veritas eius vbique diffuſa eſt:* the Bodie of Chriſt in the which he roſe can be but in one place, though his trueth is diſperſed euerie where.

Againe, we are charged to do this in remẽbrance of Chriſt; *Do this* (ſayth hee) *in remembrance of me*, in remembrance of my benefit wrought for you, & in remembrance of your ſaluation purchaſed by me. Now, remembrance is not of things preſent, but of thinges abſent. The ninth reaſon. 1. Cor. 11.

Againe, it is recorded in the ſame Chapter, *that whenſoeuer wee eate the Lords Bread and drinke of his Cuppe, wee are ſayde but to ſhewe his death vntill hee come*: ſo that it is but a ſhewe and Repreſentation of his Death, vntill his comming. The tenth reaſon.

Laſtly (to omitte many other reaſons) wee beleeue that Chriſt ſhall come from heauen, and from no other place to iudge the quicke and the dead, and that in the ſame manner hee aſcended: but if Chriſts Bodie bee made of breade, hee ſhall ſtart out of the Pixe, and not come from heauen; yea, and that in another ſhape then when hee aſcended. Which popiſh wonder, with other their ſtrange deuiſes, ſo ſauoureth of noueltie, that vnleſſe our aduerſaries haue ſtill The eleuenth reaſon. Note this wel.

whoriſh forheades they will bluſh and be aſhamed: yea, and that the rather, in that againſt theſe and many ſuch like arguments, and diuine reaſons, they cannot alledge any one teſtimonie of Scripture to proue their tranſubſtantiation; but onely that Chriſt ſayde, *Hoc eſt corpus meum*, This is my Body. Which words (as formerly appeareth) are not to bee vnderſtoode properly, but figuratiuely: not naturally, but ſignificatiuely: not carnally, but ſpiritually. Yea, beſides that which alreadie hath beene vttered, if the holy auncient Fathers, in thus expounding them, make not with vs expreſſely, and againſt our ſaid aduerſaries directly, then the victorie ſhall bee theirs, and the ſhame and ouerthrowe ours: yea, then with the foole I will fooliſhly ſay, *Non putâram*. *Tertullian*, being a holy Writer, and a verie auncient Father (for hee liued more then 1300. yeares ſince) expoundeth them thus in his fourth booke againſt the heretike *Marcion*: *Acceptum panem, & diſtributum diſcipulis, corpus ſuum illum fecit, dicendo, Hoc eſt corpus meum: id eſt, figura corporis mei.*

The auncient Fathers affirme the wordes of Chriſt to be figuratiue.

Lib. 4 Contr. Marcion.

Chriſt taking the bread and diſtributing to his Diſciples, made it his Body; ſaying, This is my Body: that is to ſay, this is a figure of my Bodie.

And in his firſt booke againſt the ſame Heretike, the ſame Authour writeth after this manner: *God did not reiect bread which is his creature; for by it he hath made a repreſentation of his Bodie.*

Idem, lib. 1.

Saint *Chryſoſtome* ſaith, *The bread ſanctified is counted worthie to bee called the Lords Body, etſi natura panis in ipſo permanſit*, though the nature of the bread remaine there ſtill.

Chryſoſt. ad Cæſar.

Theodore-

Theodoretus, aunſwering to the obiection of an heretike, is right plaine in this point: for ſayeth hee, *Signa myſtica poſt ſanctificationem non recedunt a natura ſua, ſed manent in priori ſubſtantia, et figura, & forma.* That is, The myſticall tokens after the ſanctification depart not from their owne nature, but remaine in their former ſubſtance, figure, and ſhape; yea, and are ſenſiblie ſeene to be the verie ſame they were before. Dialog. 2.

Saint *Hierome*, ſpeaking of Chriſt, ſayth, *He offered not water but wine, for the figure of his bloud.* Saint *Ambroſe* ſayeth, *that the bread and wine are the verie ſame they were, both in nature and ſubſtance.* Ambr. de Sacra. lib. 4. cap. 4.

And Saint *Auguſtine* hath written at large in many of his workes, and ſo plainely, againſt the error of tranſubſtantiation, that our aduerſaries the Papiſtes loue leaſt to heare of him of all other writers: partly for his authoritie, and partly becauſe hee openeth the matter more fully then any other. For ſayth hee, *Chriſtes fleſh and bloud was in the olde Teſtament promiſed by ſimilitudes and ſignes of their ſacrifices, and was exhibited indeed and in truth vpon the Croſſe: but the ſame is now celebrated by a Sacrament of remembraunce vpon the Altar.* Likewiſe againſt the heretike *Adimantus*, he thus writeth: *Non dubitauit dominus dicere, hoc eſt corpus meum, cùm ſignum daret corporis ſui.* Our Lorde doubted not (ſayth he) to ſay, This is my body, when hee gaue a token of his Bodie. In an other place alſo, *Chriſt tooke Iudas* (ſayth hee) *vnto his Table, wherat he gaue vnto his Diſciples the figure of his body.* Auguſt. Contr. Fauſtū. Contr. Adim. lib. 4. Idem in pſal. 3

Yea,

Yea, and to this verie Sacrament hee applyeth this rule, *Omnis res naturam et veritatem illarum rerum in se continet, ex quibus conficitur*: that is, euerie thing keepeth and containeth the nature and truth of those things, of which it consisteth.

Now (most Reuerēd, & right blessed brethrē) if these & other reuerend olde Fathers, writing to like effect, haue expounded the wordes of Christ rightly, then where is the papists transubstantiation?

Surely, surely (deare Christians) how rightly and religiously they are by the Fathers expounded, it may wel be conceiued, in that not any one of the auncient writers euer spake of reall presence, or the literall sense of these words, *This is my Body*: yea, let our aduersaries the Papists bring but one Catholick and godly learned Father, for the space of 700. years after Christ, that euer taught Popish transubstantiation, or that signified and insinuated any such matter; and we will not onely thereunto subscribe, but account also al other their vaine and vncatholike fancies, to bee right Catholike doctrine. But men, brethren, and Fathers, the best learned of that frowarde generation are so far from pleading either Canonicall Scriptures, or Catholike Fathers, as that either they say directly (as did *Alphonsus* a great Papist) *that the auncient Fathers neuer knew transubstantiation*; Or else doubtfully (as did *Gabriel Biel*, another popish doctor) *that how the Body of Christ is in the Sacrament, it is not found expressed in the Canon of the Bible:* Or else they say deceitfully (like craftie huckesters) that they must hold of the Sacraments as the Church of *Rome* doth. Which third and last affirmation being fond and foo-

Vpon the Canon, lect. 40.

lish,

liſh, is vtterly to be contemned and condemned: for Tranſubſtantiation was neuer heard of at *Rome*, or in any other part of the world, vntil it was there decreed in the late councell of *Laterane*, holden vnder Pope *Innocentius* the third, in the yeare of our Lorde God 1215. So that for the ſpace of twelue hũdred & fifteen years after Chriſt, the Church of God was well able to ſtand without it. Now therfore it ſtãdeth vs in hand conſidering the newneſſe of it, and that our Sauiour Chriſt in ſaying, *This is my Bodie*, did not aboliſh the ſubſtance of bread & wine, but did vnite the force and fruit of his fleſh crucified, and bloud ſhed for our ſins, to the elements, that ſo receiuing the one, wee might through faith, and by the operation of his working ſpirit be partakers of the other; it ſtands vs (I ſay) in hand, not to bend our mindes on the outward ſignes of bread & wine ſet before vs: but rather lifting vp our hearts from them to Chriſt, who liueth & reigneth in heauen, it behoueth vs to behold him the very lambe of God ſlaine for the ſins of the world, with the eyes and hands of our faith. *Nam fide tangitur Chriſtus, fide videtur: non corpore tangitur, non oculis comprehenditur.* For ſaith Saint *Ambroſe*, By faith Chriſt is touched, by faith he is ſeene: hee is not touched with our bodie, nor viewed with our eyes. And elſewhere: *Non corporali tactu Chriſtum, ſed fide tangimus.* That is, we touch not Chriſt (ſayth he) with our fingers, but with our faith.

The age of the Papiſts new tranſubſtantiation is 393. yeares.

Ambr. in Luc. lib. 6.

Saint *Auguſtine* likewiſe crieth: *To what end prepareſt thou thy teeth and thy belly? beleeue, and thou haſt eaten.* And in another place, *We cannot* (ſayth he) *handle Chriſt with our fingers: but with our faith wee*

Auguſt. in Ioh. tract. 25.

may. Yea, that to beleeue in Christ is to eate his flesh and drinke his bloud, Christ himselfe thus proueth it:

Ioh. 6. *Hee that commeth to me shall not hunger; and he that beleeueth in me, shall neuer thirst*. By which faith accordingly, not we, vnder the Gospell onely, do eate Christs flesh and drinke his bloud; but the Patriarkes also, and Prophets, & people of God which liued before the birth of Christ, did receiue him, and eate him,

1. Cor. 10. and liue by him: *They did* (as Saint *Paule* auoucheth) *all eate the same spirituall meat*, that is to say, *euen the same Christ that we eate, and did all drinke of the same spiritual drinke*. Whosoeuer beleeued in Christ, they were nourished by him then, as we are now. They did not see Christ: he was not yet borne, he had not yet a naturall body, yet did they eate his body: he had not yet any bloud, yet did they drinke his bloud; they beleeued that it was he, in whom the promises shuld be fulfilled, they beleeued that hee should be that blessed seed in whom all Nations shold be blessed. Thus they beleeued, thus they receiued, and did eate his body. Wherupon, the premisses considered, it may rightly be inferred, that not our mouthes, but our minds; not our bellies, but our spirits, are nourished with the flesh & bloud of Christ: & that not by chewing, or swallowing; but by remembring and beleeuing that his body was wounded, & his bloud shed for our perfect and eternall redemption.

THus hauing hitherto declared (in handling the late doting deuise of transubstantiation; wherupon in a manner dependeth all Poperie) and euen effectually proued by sufficient testimonies both out of

the

the holy Scriptures and holy auncient Fathers, that the nature of the bread remaineth in the Sacrament after the words of consecration, and that there is no mutation in substance, but in vse: it now further resteth but onely to point at an another horrible point of popish blasphemie, and so to committe you to God.

Although (beloued) our Sauiour Christ commanded the Sacrament to bee ministred to all people in both kinds: yet our aduersaries the Papistes making euen him our Sauiour to haue no wit, nor vnderstanding what he did or said at his last supper, haue lately forbidden the mysticall Cuppe of his precious bloud to be ministred to the Laitie. Wherein how shamefully soeuer, or rather how blasphemously these iollie fellowes, like iollie iuglers do iudge this matter: yet I am sure that the holy Scripture teacheth plainely, that the books of the auncient Writers testifie plentifully, and that continual practice for the space of a thousand yeares and vpwarde firmely pleadeth, and without contradiction, the contrarie. Saint *Paul* speaking to the whole congregation, sayth: *As often, as ye shall eate this bread, and drinke this cuppe, yee shew the Lords death till hee come.* 1.Cor 11. vers.26.27.28.

And againe, *Whosoeuer* (saith he) *shal eat this bread, and drinke the cup of the Lord vnworthily, shall be guiltie of the bodie and bloud of Christ.*

And againe, *Let euerie man* (saith hee) *examine himselfe, and so let him eate of this bread and drink of this cup.* He doth not say, let the Pastor and Minister examine himselfe, & so drinke of this cup; but euery man, euen euery Christiã. To iustifie which expositiõ frõ Christ himself by a generall affirmatiue, I appeal

to the tenor of the inſtitution. For as it was ſayd, *Take yee, eate yee:* ſo it was ſaid at the ſame time to the ſelfe ſame parties, *Drink ye all of this.* Which two precepts Eate ye, drinke ye, compriſeth all, both Laymen and Clerkes: and therefore both ſorts are either to bee excluded, or elſe to be admitted to receiue in both kinds.

Arguments againſt halfe Communions.

Againe, the fruit & effect of the bloud of Chriſt is common to the people with the Paſtor: *Ergo*, being partners in the thing ſignified; the outward ſigne therof, which is the Communion of his bloud ſhed for the redemption of his people, ought to be diuided indifferently betweene them.

Gal. 3. 15. Againe, A dead mans will may not bee changed: Nothing can be put to, nothing taken out, without forgerie and falſe-hood: *Ergo*, the cup of ſaluation being a part of Chriſts will, & teſtament, may not bee taken away from the Laitie without ſacriledge & bloudy crueltie. And againe, if the water in Baptiſme may not be taken away from the Lords people: then the cup of the new Teſtament may not be taken away frō them (for the bloud of Chriſt, whereby remiſſion of ſinnes is purchaſed, is repreſented by the wine of the Lords Supper, aſwel as by the water in Baptiſme): but the water in Baptiſme may not be omitted or neglected: *Ergo*, the cup of bleſſing may not (without great iniury done to the Lords people) be taken from them. Other arguments to this effect, & in ſetting forth the truth hereof, I could vſe many: but, knowing the nature of this matter to bee ſuch, as that the euidence & clearnes of the thing it ſelfe ſpeaketh for the proofe thereof, I am rather now diſpoſed to call to witneſſe in this behalfe the holy auncient Fathers.

Ignatius,

648

Ignatius, being a good olde Christian and constant Martyr of Iesus Christ in the primitiue Church, writeth thus to the Church of *Philadelphia*: *I exhort you, that you vse al one faith, one publique Ministerie & preaching of the word, and one Eucharist: for there is but one flesh of Iesus Christ, and one bloud shed for vs; one bread broken for all, and one cup distributed to all.* Note well the consent of the Fathers. Ignat. ad Philad.

Saint *Cyprian*, writing vnto *Cornelius*, saith, *How do we teach or prouoke them for the profession of his name to shed their bloud, if to them, going to the battail* (speaking of Martyrs) *wee shall denie his bloud? or how shall we make them fit for the cuppe of Martyrdome, if we admit them not first, by right of the communion, to the cup of the Lord?* Epist. 2.

Tertullian saith, *By the Sacrament of bread and of the cuppe, we haue proued in the Gospell the veritie of the bodie & of the bloud of our Lord, against the phantasticall dreames of* Marcion. Lib. 5. aduersus Marcionem.

And Saint *Chrysostome*, administring the Sacraments himselfe in the famous Citie of *Constantinople*, is so plaine in this point, that nothing can be plainer: for (saith he) *There is a thing wherein the Priest differeth nothing from the people; as when he must receiue the dreadfull Mysteries. For it is not here, as it was in the olde Law, where the Priest eate one part and the people another, neither was it lawfull for the people to be partaker of those things which the Priest was: but now it is not so, but rather one body is proposed to al & one cup.* Chrysost. in 2. ad Cor. Hom. 18.

Lastly, to the end that all men may see and perceiue what great iniurie is done to Christian people (for whom Christ died) by Pope-catholikes, the Romish

miſh Heretikes, eſpecially that ſuch falſe Catholikes themſelues may cõfeſſe it, if not with their mouthes, at the leaſt in their conſciences; I will call at this time two Popes to witneſſe. Pope *Leo* the firſt, in whoſe dayes the communion vnder both kindes was ſo ordinarie and certaine, as that it was the marke whereby to knowe the Manachees, the moſt pernicious Heretikes that were in the Church, thus auoucheth: *They take in their vnworthie mouthes the Body of the Lord, and refuſe altogether to drinke the bloud of our Redemption*; which he calleth a ſacrilegious hypocriſie. And Pope *Gelaſius* ſpeaking not of the Manachees, as *Leo* doth, but of other perſons receiued into the Chriſtian Church, thus vttereth his iudgement; *Wee haue heard, that ſome hauing onely receiued the holie portion of the bodie, do abſtaine from the cuppe of the holie bloud: but ſith that they are mooued by a fond ſuperſtition, which I know not, thus to abſtaine, either let them receiue the whole Sacrament, or els let them be wholly and vtterly reſtrained and ſhutte out from the ſame: for there can bee no diuiſion of this one Sacrament, and highe myſterie, without great Sacriledge.* Whereby it appeareth, euen in the iudgement of theſe Popes, that if we will not incur & run into apparent, violent, and wilfull Sacriledge, the communion muſt bee miniſtred to all men, without exception, in both kindes, according to the right intention of Chriſt Ieſus, and according to that courſe which the Chriſtian world diligently obſerued for the ſpace of 1230. yeares, and euer after alſo (but euen in ſome few places onely) vntill in the late Councell of *Conſtance* a wicked decree and vngodly was made

Serm. quadrag. 4.

De conſecra. diſtinct. 2. cap.

If Popes tell you this tale take heede ye Papiſts to your conſciences.

made to the contrarie. Whereupon, *Gerſon* a great Papiſt being a chiefe agent in that Councell, with other the Popes Proctours and Doctours of ſpeciall reputation, did ſo beate their braines to iuſtifie that Acte in that Councell eſtabliſhed, as that they almoſt loſt their foreheades. For the conſiderations by them alleadged, wherewith they were ledde thus to chaunge the laſt Will and Teſtament of CHRIST IESVS, are but verie poore ſhiftes and moſt miſerable inducementes: as, the length of Laymens beardes, the coſtlineſſe of wine; the difficulties firſt of getting, then of keeping wine from ſowring, from freezing, and breedinge of flies. All which and many ſuch like fooliſh and friuolous toyes thus hatched by their owne fancies, being no leſſe ridiculous then the fact was impious, muſt ſtand for reaſon (if wee will bee ruled by a whoriſh Mother the Church of Antichriſt) againſt all reaſon and religion.

Now what is mockerie, or what is iniurie to GOD and man, if it bee religion and pietie, in reſpect of long beards, in reſpect of froſtes in winter, and flies in Summer, to correct Chriſts inſtitution, and to chaſe the Lay people from the cuppe of their ſaluation, from the Communion of Chriſts bloud, and fellowſhippe of his holy ſpirite? Surely, ſurely (beloued) howſoeuer theſe daintie Diuines haue lately thus fallen into great blindneſſe, or rather wilfull madneſſe: yet vndoubtedly no Church euer reſiſted mangled Communions with greater vehemēcie thā the Church of *Rome* did, til couetouſnes & pride blinded her eies, & hardned her heart againſt

God

God and his ſonne Chriſt. Which God for Chriſt his ſake open the eyes of her corrupt Children, and ſo mollifie their hearts, as that they may receiue Chriſts holy Myſteries, not according to their owne fond fances & doting dreames; but according to the firſt inſtitution thereof, & according to the general practice of all Chriſtian Churches in former times. For otherwiſe if they ſtill lead their dayes in voluntarie blindneſſe, & wilfull wickedneſſe, they ſhall die in their ſinnes: yea, death and damnation ſhall be their portion for euer: becauſe they haue pleaſure in their owne inuentions, and do not giue their hearts to receiue, to beleeue, & to loue the truth. From which death and damnation, hee deliuer both them and vs, who to receiue the bleſſed Sacrament in both kindes by his laſt wil commanded vs, euen Ieſus Chriſt the righteous: to whom with the Father, and the holy Ghoſt, three perſons in Trinitie, one eternall, euerliuing, and euerlaſting God in vnitie, be rendered all power, all praiſe, all might, and all maieſtie, both now, and for euermore,

Amen.

FINIS.

A REPLIE TO A *Popish Pamphlet.*

Papist.

AS for the other part of his Sermon in which he inueigheth bitterly against vs, as breakers of the commandement, institution, and testamẽt of Christ, for that wee communicate the laie people vnder one kind; he forgetteth how much more iust cause the whole world hath to exclaime against him and his masters, who of the 7. Sacraments Christ left in his new & eternall Testament haue quite taken away fiue, and the two they retaine they haue sore corrupted and maymed, spoiling them of matter, forme, fruite, commodity, grace, sanctitie, &c.

Protestant. It is an olde and commonly a true saying: *The more ignorant, the more impudent.* For, my Aduersarie, being bolder then wise, threatned to examine strictly my proofe against their Communion vnder one kinde: but, forgetting himselfe, as one willing to auoide the point and issue of the controuersie in question, hee runneth from the matter, and loadeth one thing vpon another: yea instead of making a particular answere to euery particular point, he telleth a tale of his owne, he propoundeth new matter, and roaueth in such general discourses as come not neere the marke. In which his fashion, and trim course of discoursing (besides his vniust accusations and forged cauillations, against maister *Caluin*, maister *Beza* and others) hee contemneth in the first place and vtterly condemneth vs, for taking away fiue of the seauen Sacraments left by Christ (as hee ignorantly imagineth) in his newe and eternall Testament. Where-

unto if by way of answere I should enter to speake of *Caluin* & *Beza*, their wisdome, grauitie and great learning, I should doe nothing else but euen obscure and darken their true and due praise with the penurie of my pen. Adoring therfore their worthinesse with silence, I may not so passe ouer my aduersarie his accusation concerning the Sacraments, being an impudent slander and a most manifest vntruth. For howsoeuer the Synode of *Trent* pronounceth them *Anathema*, which shall say that there are either moe or fewer Sacraments of the new law than seuen: to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extream vnction, Order and Matrimony, yet it is certain and vndoubtedly true, that whersoeuer the holy ancient fathers talke of the number of the Sacraments, baptisme and the eucharist are onely mentioned to be the Sacraments of our redemption. *Augustine* in Gloss. in 4. ad Ephes & vpon Psa. 40 *Ambrose de Sacramentis*, *Tertullian*, *Chrysostome*, *Cyril*, *Gregorie*, *Cyprian*, & *Paschasius*. As for the other fiue sacraments, which with great abuse and superstition are receiued and vsed in the papisticall church, they euer reiected them, and so do we vtterly, as bastard Sacraments, wanting either signes needfull to make a Sacrament, in which there must be something outward and visible: or being destitute of Christs ordinance for any such purpose as to seale the common couenant of saluation.

And whereas it is further vrged by my Aduersarie, and without all shame and modesty affirmed, that we take, from the sacrament of Christs supper, his bodie and bloud, and account it sorcerie, to consecrate it in any sort; I will not herein accuse his ignorance (although it bee great) but rather his impudence in that he shameth not to cauill dishonestly, and thus to slander vs. For, albeit we deny, that wicked and vnworthy men receiuing the Sacrament, do receiue the body and blood of Christ: yet we confesse, that all worthy receiuers are made partakers of christs flesh (being giuen to be our nourishment vnto eternall life) in the holy Sacrament; not after a carnall, but after a diuine & spirituall maner of participation. For it was far from the meaning of our Sauiour, by blessing the bread, to change the substance of it into the substance of his flesh, and to giue power and example for others to doe the like: but Christs blessing is that action by

the

603

the which a change indeede is wrought, not in the substance, quantitie, and naturall qualities of the bread, which remaineth still as before, whereof all our senses be witnesses; but in the relation onely, that is in the office and vse: beeing now no more a bare foode of our body, but euen a pledge of our spiritual food, which wee haue from the body of our Lord. The which new qualitie and vse is put on the bread, not by magicall murmuration of words ouer it, but chiefley by the diuine institution and ordinance of Christ rehearsed and opened, and partly by the publique praiers and thanksgiuing of the Church. Wherupon, S. *Chrysostom*, speaking how the cup was consecrated by Christ to be a sacrament of his bloud, thus auoucheth: He calleth it a cup of blessing, because when wee haue it in our hands, with admiration of that vnspeakeable gift, wee praise and blesse him in that he hath shed his bloud, that wee should not remaine in errour; and hath not onely shed it, but made vs all partakers of it. In the iudgement of which ancient Father it appeareth, that the cup is blessed by giuing praise and thankes to God, and by receiuing it accordingly, and not by saying the wordes of consecration (as the Romish sort faine and foolishly imagine) ouer it. In the next place, my Aduersarie inueigheth wonderfully against vs for abolishing as much as in vs lyeth the onelie sacrifice of the new testament, and in that wee do not (with the Romanists) beleeue the sacrifice of the masse.

Whereby it appeareth that hee hath rather beene brought vp in the schoole-house of fooles then in any vniuersitie of the learned. For, *Non disputat ad idem*; but still so runneth from the purpose, as that I am affraide to be blamed for not passing ouer such his wanderings with silence: though I onely still followe him to the end, that in the end, I may examine his great learning.

To point but therefore at this point, it is wonderfull to consider how he and such like Massemongers, leading the simple people with false and subtill persuasions into the pit of destruction, teache them many shame-full things; but this aboue all other (as most needfull to be held of all) that *the masse is a sacrifice strong and effectuall to take away sinne.* Whereas S. *Paule è contra* teacheth plainely, that *Christ was offered vp once, to take*

6990a

away all sinne; and by that one oblation (becauſe it was perfect) obtained the full deliuerie and redemption of his Church. Yea, and to the end that his words may the rather bee credited, he bluſheth not to auouch (like an vnſhamefaſt lyer) how *Caluin and others granted that all the auncient Fathers beleeued the ſacrifice of the Maſſe.* Now we know with *Caluin*, and willingly acknowledge with the holy auncient Fathers, that among other ſacrifices of praiſe and thankeſgiuing, the celebration of the Lordes ſupper is a ſpeciall ſacrifice in the ſame kinde, and that for the onely ſacrifice of Chriſt once offered vpon the croſſe: but it was neuer meant, much leſſe by antiquitie beleeued, that the naturall body of Chriſt (as this drowſie Dotterell dreameth) is in the Sacrament offered vp againe an expiatorie ſacrifice for ſin, or made corporally preſent by the words of the Prieſt to euerie communicant, ſaue only to the worthy receiuer ſpiritually by faith. For, Chriſt did not at his laſt ſupper offer a ſacrifice (that hee did the next day:) but ordained a ſacrament: Hee gaue nothing to his father, as muſt be done in a ſacrifice; but hee gaue himſelf in a Myſterie to his Diſciples, as vſeth to be done in Sacraments. And we are enioyned to do what Chriſt did: that is, to adminiſter a ſacrament, not to offer an externall ſacrifice. Beſides, Saint Paule declareth plainely, that without ſhedding of bloud no ſacrifice can blot out ſinne. If Chriſt therefore be ſacrificed or offered in his Supper for the expiation of ſinne, his precious and moſt comfortable blood is ſhed and powred forth againe: for *without bloudſhed is no remiſsion.* It muſt be a bloudy
Heb. 9. 22. ſacrifice (not a drie ſacrifice) for which ſinne is pardoned. And elſewhere, *Chriſt* (ſayth the ſame Apoſtle) *by his owne bloud entred once for all into the holy place, and found eternall redemption.* By vertue of which eternall ſacrifice once offred for al on the croſſe, ſinne being forgiuen in Gods choſen & pardoned, there remaineth no ſacrifice for ſinne, but euen a commemoration and a memoriall. Onely, true it is, that this Sacrament hath beene of ſome ancient Fathers, and may be of vs called a ſacrifice in reſpect (as they at one time or another expounded themſelues) of prayers, praiſes, and workes of charitie (which are all ſpirituall ſacrifices) as alſo for the *offering vp of our ſelues as a liuely ſacrifice, holy & acceptable vnto God*, Ro. 12. But properly it is no ſacrifice,

nor

60520

nor can be so said, without intollerable derogation and wrong to the all sufficient sacrifice of Christ himselfe, by which hee hath perfectly sanctified all that beleeue. *The bloud of Iesus Christ* (sayth *Saint Iohn*, 1. Ioh. 1.7.) *cleanseth vs from all sin.* And S. Paul saith, *In him we are made complete*, Colos. 2. 10. Yea it is recorded, Hebrew. 10. 14. That *Christ with his one offering hath made perfect for euer them that are sanctified.* Which words being spoken in defence and declaration of the valure and efficacie of Christs death once offered, doe of themselues manifestly ouerthrow the blasphemous sacrifice of the masse. And therefore (to conclude this point) I will say with Saint *Augustine* (Auguſt. lib. 83. quæst. quæ. 61.) *Christus est Sacerdos noster in æternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech, qui semetipsum obtulit, holocaustum pro peccatis nostris; & eius sacrificii similitudinem celebrandam in suæ passionis memoriam commendauit.* Christ is our Priest for euer after the order of *Melchisedech*, which hath offered vp himselfe a sacrifice for our sinnes; and hath deliuered vnto vs a similitude or likenesse of that sacrifice to bee vsed in remembrance of his Passion.

Lastly, another speciall by-matter I cannot (vnder correction) but remember, where this Doctor, without diuinitie, seemeth (toward the end of his deep learned treatise) to cast in our dish the great want of learning in Ministers. Wherunto I might answere, that many of their best Clerkes, being holy by profession, but in practise no honester then Pope *Ioane*, write oftentimes false latine, by ioyning the masculine and feminine gender together: but as in answering I doe acknowledge that there are some such watchmen amongst vs as are not sufficientlie qualified to direct and instruct others: so let it bee spoken to Gods glorie and our comfort, that there are many, not hundreds but thousands of such wise and learned teachers as walking in all vprightnesse of holy and vndefiled cõuersation, are able learnedly to dispute, and wisely to confute any point of popery: yea we are vnworthy of our liues, if wee will not auouch and maintaine the wonderfull blessing of God in our Ministerie at this day. For howsoeuer it be debased by some, yet it dooth so far differ (God be thanked) from the present state of the Romish Clergie, whose pestilent properties Saint *Iohn* shewsth, Apoc. 9

by comparing the harme which they doe in the church to the torments which they suffer that are stung with scorpions, as that I am fully perswaded there neither is, nor euer was a more learned ministerie in any Nation vnder heauen. Neuertheless, it is acknowledged (which is to bee lamented) that some of our watchmen are blinde, that they lie asleepe and delight in sleeping: onely on the behalfe of such let it bee spoken to my Aduersarie, especially to his fathers shame, that if any so wanting knowledge or vertue would forsake the church of Christ to the losse of his soule, and so becomming a Seminarie should ioine himselfe to the Romish harlot inseparably henceforward, hee should bee had vndoubtedly in great admiration, and deserue wonderfull commendation: for, Sir *Iohn Lacklatine*, and Sir *Antony Ignorance* are their chiefest Clarkes, and best Massemongers.

Papist. *I might answere all hee brings, in few words: namely, in saying Christ to haue had another drift and intent in celebration and in the publique administring of this Sacrament, then he had in the particular receiuing of it by euery one. Therefore when he instituted the perpetuall celebration and ministration of it he vsed both kindes, and therefore by the church it is alwaies celebrated vnder both: But when he setteth forth the fruit euery one by their particular receiuing is to reape by it, (as Iohn 6.) he placeth the whole as wel in one as in both, for that the spirituall refection which concerneth euery particular communicant is as well in one as in both kinds: and therefore he saith whosoeuer shall eat of this bread, shall liue for euer.*

Protest. At the length, my Aduersarie comming to the matter, sheweth at the first his antichristian Pride, in that hee seemeth to bee wiser then Christ, who instituting the Sacrament commanded it to bee receiued in both kindes; as also then the Apostles and Fathers of the primitiue church, who euer gaue it in both kindes. Now I would not haue him ignorant, least hee should bee still arrogant in himselfe, that Christs commaundement binding Christians to receiue the cup, is plaine and effectuall; *Bibite ex hoc omnes, Drinke ye all of this*, And therefore the Apostle S. *Paul*, so interpreting it, 1. Cor. 11. deliuered as well,

the

the cup as the bread to the whole Church, euen as he had receiued of the Lord. Yea, the same Apostle, being indued with the spirit of Christ (and therefore the best interpreter of Christs Institution) giueth a flat precept in the same chapter, verse 28. *Probet seipsum homo, &c. Let a man try himselfe, and so let him eate of that bread, and drinke of that cuppe.* These are plaine precepts, *Let him eate, Let him drinke.* For, as the Institution is of eating and drinking, so is the Apostles commaundement drawne frō the Institution: wherein there is as great a commaundement to the whole Church, both Priest and People, for the one, as for the other; yea, the bread may as well be kept from the people as the cuppe, in that they haue as great right by the ordinance of Christ, to both the pledges of their saluation, as to the one. And therefore where Christ said, *Drinke ye all of this, Paschasius* to make the matter plainer, putteth thereunto these words, *Tam Ministri, quàm reliqui credentes: As well the Ministers, as the rest of the faithfull.* S. *Augustine* in like manner saith, *Simul hoc sumimus: simul bibimus: quia simul viuimus: We receiue together, wee drinke together: because we liue together.* And S. *Chrysostome* saith, *Et in pane, et in calice Christus dixit, Hoc facite in meam commemorationem: Christ both in the bread and also in the cup said, Doe this in remembrance of me.*

Now if my Aduersarie will not believe either S. *Chrysostome* or S. *Augustine*, or *Paschasius*, yet if of his curtesie he wil believe his owne Catholique Doctors, & the chiefe Champions of that side (for heerein diuers of them prooue themselues to bee our rightfull Aduocates) I am in good hope to worke his conuersion. *Gerardus Lorichius* saith, *Ipsius Sacramenti institutio, vult vt omnes vnà manducemus et bibamus: the very institution of the Sacrament it selfe willeth, that we eate and drinke together.* Also elsewhere, *There are*, saith he, *false and counterfait Catholicks, vvhich make no conscience of hindering the reformation of the Church, by all manner of meanes. They, to the end that the other kind may not be giuen to the Laitie, spare not to vtter blasphemies. For, they say, that Iesus Christ said vnto his Apostles onely, Drinke yee all: & therein doe nothing consider the proper words of the Canon*; Take, eate yee all. *Let them therefore, I pray you, tell vs, if these words also should be intended and meant onely to the Apostles: for then also the Laitie must*

De Miss. publica proroganda.

must needs abstaine from the bread; which would proue a pestilent heresie, and an execrable blasphemie. Wherefore, we must conclude (saith he) *that both the one and the other word was intended and meant vnto the whole church.*

Cassander de vtraq; specie. pa. 29.

And *Ruardus Tapper*, the Deane of *Louane* saith thus: *Habito respectu ad Sacramentum, eiusq; perfectionem, magis conueniret, sub vtraq; specie fieri Communionem, quàm sub altera tantùm. Hoc enim magis consonum est eius institutioni, et integritati, et refectioni corporali: imò et exemplo Christi, & Patrum Primitiuæ Ecclesiæ:* that is, *Consideration had vnto the Sacrament, and to the perfection of the same, it were more conuenient, that the communion were ministred vnder both kindes, then vnder one alone. For this were more agreeable to the institution, and purity thereof, and to the outward refection of the body: yea, and to the example both of Christ, and also of the Fathers of the primitiue church.* Wherupon, as also vpon former premisses it must needs be granted, that we haue iust cause and occasion to taxe my Aduersary & other Romish Prelates, for adulterating Christs holy and blessed Institution, whose action herein ought to be our instruction; and whose institution our direction: yea, he is to be followed of vs in all substantiall things, and needfull circumstances; least otherwise, instead of a sacrament of Christ, wee thrust vpon the church our owne fonde fansies and doting dreames. But my Aduersary (as appeareth by his answer) vainly goeth about to proue, that in respect of the grace and effecte of the Sacrament, there is no difference whether a man receiue both kinds, or one: because our Sauiour who attributed life to the eating and drinking of his body and bloud, doth also (saith he) affirme the same effect, which is life euerlasting, to come of eating vnder one form only. *Iohn 6. If any man eate of this bread he shall liue for euer.* Wherunto replying I do say, that Christ in this place speaketh not of the Sacrament, but of the matter of the Sacrament, which is his flesh and bloud, to be eaten spiritually by faith. Whereupon S. *Augustine* sayth: *Why prepareſt thou thy teeth and belly? Beliene & thou hast eaten it*, In Ioh. Tr. 25. Yea, if God in this point also, and to this effect hath not opened the mouthes of our Aduersaries to conuince themselues of bolde falshood, let them haue no accusers. For, som Pope-catholicks, namely, *Gabriel Cusanus, Caietanus, Ruardus Tapper, Hesselius, Iansenius,*

Iansenius, and others, hold opinion with vs, that this chapter meddleth not with any sacramentall eating of Christs body, or drinking his bloud in the Eucharist: Besides, that Christ by bread in this place, meaneth not the Sacrament in form of bread (as Papists call it) it is manifest by this argument, *Whosoeuer eateth this bread, shall liue for euer*: but whosoeuer eateth the Sacrament, shall not liue for euer (for of some it is receiued vnto destruction, *August. in Ioan. Tr. 26.*) therefore whosoeuer eateth the Sacrament, eateth not this bread.

Other arguments to this purpose, as it is needlesse to frame any; so, now to conclude, my Aduersarie may knowe by that which formerly hath been vttered, & will (if he haue any spark of grace) accordingly acknowledge, that the people comming to the holy Cõmunion, ought to receiue the same in both kinds: And that all such as breake wilfully, and violate this ordinance of Christ by mangling it, doe therein most wickedly, and are very Church-robbers.

Papist. *Yet, for the better satisfaction of others, I will not onelie answer euery particular argument he brings, but adde more to them, and vvill fortifie and make them more strong he hath brought, which he for want of learning could not doe. This Ministers first argument is drawne from Christs precept: but because he brings no place for any such precept, but the vvordes of the institution, vvhich containe no commaundement, an argument in this behalfe may more Scholer-like thus be propounded: Christ commaunded vs all to communicate vnder both kinds, in that he said, Iohn 6,* Vnlesse yee eate the flesh of the Sonne of man, and drinke his bloud, you shall haue no life in you.

Protestant. O hominis impudentis audaciam! O shameless & euen most impudent boldnesse! How dare my Aduersary vndertake to teach others, hauing not learned his Grammar? For, in aunswering to my first argument against their Communion vnder one kind, he denieth the words of Christs Institution to be a precept. Now, what good stuffe may be looked for heereafter, from such a wicked wretch and witlesse, as knoweth not the force and effect of the Imperatiue moode? For, to eate and

to drinke at the Lords Table, is not a thing indifferent, and left free by the Institution, but an expresse commandement, and therefore of necessitie: it is the Imperatiue moode, and therefore a commandement, both in the Institution, and by the Apostle, 1. Cor. 11.23. saying, *That which I receiued I deliuered*; grounding his commandement vpon the Institution, and therefore commanded in the Institution. By vertue of which commandement wee stand bound to resort to this sacrament, and are no lesse tied heereunto, then we are to keepe the Saboath, or to honour Parents, &c. For that God that commanded these duties did also imperatiuelie & commandinglie, say, Eat yee, drinke ye. Briefly therefore to shew the desperatnesse of our Aduersaries Cause, let vs but onlie remember a memorable answere of their Cardinall *Cusanus*: who, beeing vrged with the commandement of Christ in defence of the ancient and necessarie vse of both kindes, doth thus euade; *Scriptures*, saith hee, *according to the diuers occasions of times, are to admit diuers constructions*. As though latter times could countermaund the Primitiue. Wherupō it may be sufficient to oppose the iudgement of their owne *Lorichius*; who in the zeale which hee had to the commandement of Christ, saying, *Drink ye all of this*, dooth call all them Pseudocatholikes, that is, false Catholikes, who by a false glosse doe hinder the reformation of the church heerein. But it is time (and I pray you) to consider how it pleaseth my yong master to fortifie and make stronger my argument, which I could not doe (as he saith) for want of learning.

Cusanus epist. 2. de vsu communi ad Bohemas pag 833.

Christ commanded vs all, saith hee, *to communicate vnder both kindes, in that he said*, Ioh 6. *vnlesse ye eat the flesh of the sonne of man and drinke his blood you shall haue no life in you*. Behold heere and wonder at this my Prompter his wisdom and great learning. For, although he could not answer to my first argument; yet he thus answereth (at the first) to his own. *This place of Saint* Iohn, saith hee, *cannot auaile the Protestants any thing, for that they beeleeue not this chapter to speake of the Sacrament*. Now loe, is not this sillie subtill sophister a worthy disputer, that will thus both argue & answer, to the end he may say that for me which I neuer thought? Surely, surely, if in this respect he deserueth not whipping cheere, I appeale to the iudgement of all Papists. For

what

what sense is there or sauor, that I should propound such an argument? knowing (as is alreadie proued) that the Apostle speaketh not in this chapter of the sacrament, but of the matter of the sacramẽt. Hoping therfore that his best friends wil blush at his boldnesse, I leaue him to his owne impudency, and will reply vpon that which followeth.

Papist. *This Minister addeth out of* Caluin *these words* (As often as ye shall eate of this bread and drinke of this cup; *againe*, Let euery man examine himselfe, and so let him eat of this bread and drinke of this cup) *to haue beene spoken to the whole congregation, that is the church: which he is not able to proue. For though that as the other scriptures are written for the good of the whole church: yet it is wel knowne, this Epistle to haue been written to reforme some abuses of that particular church of the Corinthians: and if hee had spoken these words to al of that church of* Corinth, *it could not serue their turne against vs, who deny not but that some particular churches at the first, vpon indulgence, were permitted to communicate vnder both kindes.*

Protest. My Aduersary, not knowing how to answere the testimonies alleadged out of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, against Communion vnder one kinde, auoucheth the said Epistle to haue bin written to reform some abuses of that particular church. Now he might more easily & yet full as honestly haue told vs that S. *Paule* is an Hereticke, as that the precepts of his Epistles (for there is the same reason against all, sith they were all written to particular churches or men) serue not against the Romish church: But this fellow shewes what maister hee serues, in that denying at the first sight the said precepts to haue beene cõmended to the whole cõgregation he seemeth to confine the whole epistle to that time & church, as if it were now out of date like an old Almanack, & did not belong to the church of God at this day. But vpon better cõsideration &c. (for he is *nimis acutus*) hee confesseth that some particular churches communicated at the first vnder both kindes: yet being loath to plead *Guilty*, he saith, if you will beleeue his honest worde, that so to doe they were permitted vpon indulgence. Now, the blessed Apostle

(whatsoeuer a cursed Catiue may imagin to the contrary) knew no such limitation: And therefore commanding all men (without exception) to examine themselues before they come to the Lords Supper, 1. Cor. 11. commaundeth them all likewise to eat and to drinke.

Papist. *And because some communicated vnder both kinds*, viz. *the Priests, some vnder one, the Laitie; the Apostle vseth the selfe same words, sometimes coniunctiuely*, Whosoeuer eateth this bread and drinketh this cup, &c: *and sometimes disiunctiuely*, so often as you shall eat this bread, or drinke this cup, &c.

Protest. They that will not be warned by that which already is deliuered, but still look for good wares from this Marchant, may euen now see Satan to be diuided against himselfe. For, although the Ring-leaders of Romish religion haue thus translated the Apostle S. *Paul* his words, *As often as ye shall eate this Bread and drinke this Cup, ye shall shew the Lords death till hee come*: yet such is the forehead of this wicked wretch & shameless, as that he blusheth not impudently to falsifie, and thus (by changing of a word) to peruert the sense of them; *As often as yee shall eate this Bread or drinke this Cup*: and so placing *or*, for *and*, most wickedly inferreth, (but whether ignorantly or maliciously, let God iudge, and all good men learne to beware of him) that eyther onely by eating, or onely by drinking, the Sacrament may bee receiued, thereby to shew the Lords death till he come.

Papist. *The effect of Christs bloud is common to the people with the Pastor, sayth this Minister: therefore if they bee Partakers of the thing signified, they ought to be partakers of the Signe.*

This argument is not worth a rush. For what dooth hee talke of the thing signified, to wit, the bloud of Christ, when he beleeues the bloud, by vvhich vvee vvere redeemed not to bee there? Catholickes, contenting themselues vvith the thing it selfe there contayned, to vvit, the body and bloud of Christ, striue not about the signe: but these vvretches fighting against it, and denying the thing contayned, the bodie of Christ, doe exchange for a sole signe

or

or shadow, the substance and vertue of the Sacrament.

A dead mans Will may not be altered, saith this Minister, and therefore the cuppe of saluation beeing a part of Christs vvill and testament, may not be changed without sacriledge.

It may suffice for answere, that these wretches take away both body and bloud, and deny his reall bloud to be in the cuppe, without vvhich it is no cuppe of saluation: for we were not redeemed or saued with the corruptibles of siluer or gold, nor vvith a figure or signe of Christs bloud, but with his true and reall bloud.

Protestant. Where nothing is aunswered, it were not amisse to reply nothing. For, behold how in stead of answering to these two arguments, with what boldnesse and impudencie hee hath belied vs. For, we all ioyntly iumpe and agree, that by the Sacrament of Christs Supper (whereof it is heere mentioned) vve are made partakers of his body and bloud, and bee there-with nouriſhed & fed in the house of the Lord, which is his Church, after that wee are entred into the same thorow Baptisme. For, the Sacraments are not voide and emptie signes, but full: that is to say, They are not onely signes, whereby some thing is signified; but they are also such signes as doe exhibit, and giue the thing that they signifie, in deed. As for example, the sacramentall signes of bread, and wine, doe not onely feed the body, as they did before; but they bring with them also such foode as feedeth the soule. Yea, as surely as we receiue bread and wine: so surely we receiue Christ and his benefits; yet not corporallie with our teeth, but spiritually by faith: according to this his owne saying, Iohn 6. *He that commeth to me shall not hunger; and he that believeth in me, shall neuer thirst.*

Papist. *And, that the Apostles participated the Laitie of the Sacrament, by ministring but one kind (who were made the Legators and Executors as it were of that testament, & to whō the disposing of these things were committed, as beeing made the Dispensers of Gods mysteries) appeares, Act.* 2. They continued stedfastly in the Apostles doctrine, and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, & in prayers: *as also Act.* 20. Vpon one of the Sabaoth dayes, vvhen the

Diſciples came together for to breake bread; *but not a word of the Cup in either place.*

Proteſtant. This ſtout Champion, fearing greatly, that ſtill to face & outface a bad cauſe with bare words, he cannot be ſuffered, appealeth (as appeareth) to the holy Scripture. Whereupon replying, I do ſay, it cannot be prooued out of theſe places that the bleſſed ſacrament was miniſtred in one kinde. Indeed, ſome olde writers doe vnderſtand this communicating in breaking of bread, of the Euchariſt: others, *de conuiuio naturæ, non de Sacramento gratiæ*, of the ſocietie and brotherlie fellowſhippe that was amongſt the Apoſtles, and the church in their loue feaſts: but, neuer any one of them all, of the communicating of the Sacrament vnder one kinde. Yea, who knoweth not, that it is ordinarie in the Scripture to comprehend the whole vnder the name of a part, by the figure *Synechdoche*? And ſo, to eate or to break bread, is put for to dine or ſup: as *Luke* 14.1. 2. *Theſ.* 3.8 When Chriſt is ſaide to eat bread in the Phariſes houſe, did hee not drinke, and eat meate alſo? yet by this ſilly ſubtile Sophiſter his reaſon, he did not.

Papiſt. *And not onelie theſe executors, but the Teſtator himſelfe, Chriſt, before he cõſecrated & ordered his Apoſtles Prieſts, did cõmunicate them vnder one kinde of bread, as being then lay men; as appeareth by S.* Luke: *but after he had giuen authoritie to conſecrate, and ordered them Prieſts, by ſaying,* Hoc facite in meam commemorationem, *then he gaue to them the Chalice alſo, and not before: as appeares by theſe wordes:* in like manner the Chalice, after hee had ſupped, ſaying, This is, &c.

Proteſtant. I might replie, that *Franciſcus Suarez*, a man of high eſteeme in the Popiſh Church, (*Diſp.* 41. *de Euchar.*) reprooues *Bellarmine* and *Iohn* of *Louane*, for holding this opinion: namely, that Chriſt gaue the Sacrament in the forme of bread, in the time of his Legall ſupper; & the wine, when ſupper was ended, after many other actions. But replying, I doe account it a maruel beyond all maruels, that any durſt in ſo cleare light of the Goſpel charge Chriſt Ieſus to haue ad-

administred the communion vnder one kinde: For, I am sure my Aduersarie may looke in S. *Luke* his Gospell, vntill his eies drop out of his head, before he can finde any proofe to and for that purpose. Yea it appeareth euen *è contra* in the same Gospell, chap. 22. that Christ ministred the cōmunion vnder both kinds to his Apostles, being then as lay men. For in these words (*Hoc facite, doe this*) Authoritie and commandement was onlie giuen to the Church to celebrate the Mysterie of the Lordes Supper: but the most speciall calling and appointing of the Apostles to the office of preaching the worde and administring the sacraments to all nations, was after his resurrection: as appeareth *Math.* 28 19. *Mark.* 16. 15. albeit Christ had before sent them out to preach to the Israelites, *Math* 10. 6. 7. vnto whom also they administred the Sacrament of Baptisme, or rather Christ by them. *Iohn* 4. 2.

Papist. *And after his resurrection hee also ministred it vnder one kinde only, to* Cleophas *and his fellows*, Luke 24. *as S.* Chrysost. S. Austen, Theoph. *and other Doctors doe not onely affirme, but proue, out of the circūstance of taking of bread into his hands, blessing it, and of the effect it wrought in lightening them to know our Lord, &c.*

Protestant. It might be replied, that the frame and scope of the Historie is cleane contrarie. For *Luke* had said before, that they had trauailed farre, that they came neere vnto a Village, that the night beganne to come on, &c. All which is as much as to say, that it was time to eate and refresh themselues. But replying I doe say, that albeit this place were to be vnderstood of the Celebration of the Lords Supper (as some of the auncient Fathers doe thinke) yet I dare say, that none of them, so thinking, gathereth example or warrant of ministration in one kind. For, breaking of bread should be heer takē figuratiuely for the whol Sacrament, by *Synecdoche*; which is vsed when a part is named for the whole: and besides, it cannot be said that Christ gaue bread onely, as the Sacrament, except it bee said also that hee consecrated in one kinde; which I am sure my Aduersarie will confesse to bee vnlawfull and sacrilegious. But against him and such other professors of new diuinitie, as defend the one kinde

(euen

(euen bread onely) by Christs example and the Apostles, to be distributed to the Laytie in the primitiue Church, I will not here offer so much any sight of ours, as theirs against themselues. For, no Aduersarie can giue them deeper woundes then their owne swordes. And if ciuil discord can giue vs hope of their ruine, *Rome* cannot stand. In this point (as also about other principall points of religion) there are two opinions of the Romish Catholickes, the one opposite to the other. The first is of *Iohn* of *Louan*, and others; who holde that the sacrament of the Euchariſt was giuen to the two disciples in *Emmaus*: The other, of *Cornelius Iansenius*, vpon the same place; who teacheth that the bread blessed by Christ in *Emmaus*, was not the Sacrament, but onely a figure of it. *Bellarm. lib. 4. cap. 24. pag. 563.*

Besides, howsoeuer my Aduersary would make vs belieue, that our Lord hath not only not commanded the sacrament to be administred vnder both kindes; but that hee himselfe hath done the contrary: it may be replyed, to his euerlasting shame and condemnation, how the Councell of *Constance* (though it took the Cup away) confesseth plainly that the Communion vnder one kinde, was neither instituted by Christ, nor vsed in the primitiue Church.

Licet Christus suis discipulis administrauerit sub vtraq; panis & vini specie, &c.

Papist. *If the water in Baptisme may not be taken awaie, sayth this Minister, then the cup of the new Testament may not be taken from them; for the bloud of Christ whereby we haue remission of sins is represented by the wine, as well as by the water in Baptisme: but, the water in baptisme may not be taken. Therefore, neither the Cup, without great iniurie. Christs Apostles S.* Paul *and Saint* Peter, Tit. 3. 1. Pet. 3. *doe say that Baptisme dooth saue vs: but this Minister of Antichrist, that it representeth our saluation; to exclude the operation and effect of that Sacrament.*

Protestant. This popeling answereth not directly; and besides, like a venemous viper, he affirmeth an error and grosse absurditie. For, in the 3. chap. to *Tit.* there is no one word to proue that Baptisme giueth grace, *ex opere operato, of the worke wrought:* but the Apostle sayth that God hath saued vs by the

renuing

renuing of the holy Ghost; which is testified by the Sacrament of Baptisme, which is Sacramentally the fountaine of regeneration, not by the worke wrought, but by the grace of Gods spirit, by which we are iustified. So speaketh Saint *Peter*, and explicateth himselfe, 1. *Pet.* 3. 21. *Baptisme saueth vs; not the washing off the filth of the bodie, but the interrogation of a good conscience, &c.* Whereby it appeareth (howsoeuer this Minister of darkenesse boasteth himselfe to be an Angell of light) that Baptisme is not the efficient cause of our saluation; but a seale of Gods spirit, regenerating vs to eternall life.

Papist. *But for answere to this argument, I say that hee and his take away both body and bloud: neither of which they beleeue to bee there, but feedes the people onely with shadowes, figures, and representions; as though our redemption were but* Platoes Idæa, *a meere fiction: whereas we take neither away; but giue the Laitie both body and bloud (though vnder one kinde) as I haue prooned alreadie.*

Protest. My Aduersary thinketh (as it seemeth) that he can daunce in a net naked, and yet no man see him: but I ween, euery indifferent Reader wil easily espy his maner of dealing, (*viz.*) that hee hath nothing in him, but cauils, slanders, and notorious leasings. For, this cauilling obiection hath beene often made by Papists, and often answered, as all men know: yea, he himselfe being in great perplexity, and hauing (as it may be imagined) a troubled braine, vttered the verie like words, and euen to the same effect bitterly inueighed against vs twise before. Wherevnto if it may please any to peruse my Replication, his word will appeare and shall be found to be no Gospell; but, an impudent slaunder: and as for his proofe concerning their Communion vnder one kinde, hee may blush and be ashamed, and all Papists for his sake.

Papist. *Baptisme is not, in this, like to the other Sacrament hee compares it vnto. For, Baptisme hath no matter but water: and therfore that taken away, no Sacrament. But in that he compares it vnto, there is in either kinde a distinct matter, a seuerall forme and consecration, and so in either kinde a true Sacrament.*

6990a

Protestant. My Aduersarie here bewrayeth more will than wit, and yet more wit than good conscience; in that, vnder shadow of deuotion, he & his Masters presuptuously vndertake to māgle Christs last institutiō, & sacrilegiously to rob Gods people of one half of that heauēly prouision, which our Sauiour left (for his last and deerest Legacie) to his Church for euer. For, this Sacrament consisteth of two signes, to wit, bread and wine: not of bread alone, or of wine alone, (for why then doe they consecrate both, if one will serue? but, of bread and wine, by which signes our perfect foode or reliefe is signified and sealed to vs. Moe signes need not, because these are sufficient to shew perfect refection: and againe, if one were wanting, the Sacrament of perfect nourishment were maimed and defaced. For, it is a hungry dinner, where there is no meat, & a dry feast where there is no drinke. Yea, this case is so plaine, that *Gabr. Biel* a learned Popish Writer, confesseth the same. It is not (saith he) sufficient to haue the grace of the Communion by the taking of the body, which is signified by the element of bread, if we haue not the grace of redemption by the blood signified by the element of wine. Now, albeit the Lord instituted the Cup as wel as the Bread, and prayed, & gaue thanks for the one as wel as for the other, bidding thē drink all of the wine, as well as eat of the bread; yet my aduersary & his Masters, teaching the cōtrary, do produce some shewes of reason for this their impudent and shameless dealing. It is nedless (say they) to adde the wine vnto the bread. For, when we receiue that, we feed on whole Christ: and partaking of his bodie, we must needs withall partake of his blood, which is contained in the veynes.

See heere how shamelesly they controwle Christ himselfe. For, if we receiue the blood in receiuing his bodie, why did hee ordaine the Cup as well as the Bread? yea, and what reason can be alleaged, why *Ministers* may not receiue the blood onely in the veines as well as the people? But the words of Christ may decide this controuersie, when he saith, *Drinke ye all of this: This is my blood, &c. which was shed for you, and for many for remission of sinnes.* For, who are those many? Euen all that should afterwards beleeue in him. To those for whom Christ his blood

was

was shed, the Cup must bee administred: but his blood was shed for private men as well as for Ministers: and therefore the Cup must be administred to them as wel as vnto the Ministers. Yea, to proceede a little further, in prooving that they which eate the bread, ought also to drinke of the Cuppe in the Lords Supper, I appeale to Saint *Paules* doctrine, where he expresly saith, *Let euerie man eate of this bread, and drinke of this Cup.* He will haue them to drinke as well as to eate, bee they what they may be, Ministers or others, without exception of any. For, the Apostle writing to all Christians in *Corinth*, reprooued the vnworthy receiuing of many, and prescribed a remedie to them all. Now the greater number were of the Laitie, and not Ministers: it was not a Church consisting wholly of Pastors and Ministers. Therefore not onely Ministers, but others also may receiue the wine, as well as the bread, and the bread as wel as the wine: yea, whē they do receiue the one, they must receiue the other: not one onely, but both; seeing Christ hath thus commanded, and the Apostles euer obserued it without making any tradition to the contrarie. 1. Cor. 11. 28.

Papist. *His two last arguments are drawne, one from the authoritie of the Fathers, and another from the prescription and custome of so many yeeres. As for the Fathers, they may be answered by the same grounds and rules by which wee before answered and expounded the Gospel, for that they doe but allude to those places, and vsed either the selfe-same words and Phrases, or verie like, that so their words might more resemble those places. And therefore as our Aduersaries, vpon that similitude of Phrases, take occasion to peruert the meaning of the Fathers, and seduce the ignorant: So will I, to cleare and make manifest the true meaning, expound them as I did the Apostles words before. For the Fathers neuer doubted, but that whosoeuer receiued any peece of either part of that Sacrifice, he was made partaker both of the body and Cuppe; for that, as the Apostle saith, those that eate the hostes, are partaker of the Aultar.*

Protestant. Although the Apostle *S. Paul* commanded the Corinthians in generall to examine themselues, and so to eate of the Lords bread at the Lords table, and to drinke of his cup,

And though S. *Chryſ.* in his time ſayd, there is a thing wherin the Prieſt differs nothing frō the people; as whē he muſt receiue the dreadfull myſteries, &c. Yet this Hel-hound, like the Apoſtle of Antichriſt, ſowing tares amōg the wheat, deſperatly auoucheth the contrarie. Yea, and to prooue that the Sacrament ought to be miniſtred vnder one kinde, hee thus argueth: *They that eate the hoſtes,* (*ſaith the Apoſtle,* 1. Cor. 10. 18.) *are partakers of the Aultar*: Ergo, *Whoſoeuer receiueth any peece of either part of this Sacrament, is made partaker both of the body, and cup.*

This Aduerſarie (as appeareth) maketh no conſcience how he interpret the ſcripture, ſo he may any way make it ſeem to ſerue his turne. For, if theſe words of the Apoſtle were to bee taken in this ſenſe, and thus to be conſtrued, it muſt needes follow, and bee graunted that theſe teſtimonies are vaine and friuolous, yea, and Chriſts cōmandement to adminiſter vnder both kindes altogether ſuperfluous: which thing agreeth not with the wiſdome and prouidence of the Almightie, who made and ordained nothing without very good and iuſt cauſe. And therefore, replying, I may truely ſay to mine aduerſarie, that the wordes by him alleaged are abuſed; yea, and that great iniurie is done to the holy Apoſtle of Chriſt, in thus applying the ſenſe of thē. For who will grant him this concluſion: or that it was lawfull to abſtaine from the drinke offrings, becauſe by eating they were made partakers of the aultar? They were made partakers of the aultar, which took no benefit therof, although they obſerued the whole inſtitution of God: much leſſe ſpirituall benefit ſhould they obtaine, that brake the ordinance of God, and were partakers but of one kinde onely.

Papiſt. *Yet for a particular anſwere to Saint* Leo *and* Gelaſius, *you muſt firſt obſerue, that where he ſaith before the citing of them, that it was ſo ordinarie and certaine a thing to receiue vnder both kindes, that Saint* Leo *vſed it to diſcerne the* Manichees; *the cleare contrarie will appeare to enerie reaſonable man that conſiders either the words in the ſame author and place. For if it had not beene the faſhion of ſome Catholicke Chriſtians to receiue vnder one kinde, but as this Miniſter would haue it, were both bound, and did receiue vnder both kindes; the* Manichees *neither would nor could haue*

receiued

receiued that Sacrament with vs, to that ende Saint Leo *said they did,* viz, vt tutiùs lateant, *that is,* To lie hid with more safetie; *and not bee discouered what they were: for that if none had receiued so but themselues, they could not haue beene hidden by that meanes, but* ipso facto *had bewrayed themselues to bee* Manichees. *And therefore for the better bewraying of them, by Saint* Leo *his direction the custome of communicating vnder one kinde, was in that place intermitted for a time: as we deny not, but it may be done by the dispensation of our Prelates the dispensers of Gods Mysteries; either for bewraying of Heretikes as then it was, or to appease some heresie lately risen, as it was afterwards done by the Councell of* Basill. *As for* Gelasius, *liuing not long after Saint* Leo, *in his time the same custome continued still, or was receiued againe, for descrying these and such like heretikes.*

Protestant. I might reply, that the *Manichees* did abstaine from receiuing the Cup, because they did heretically beleeue, that there was an euill spirt in wine: but replying I doe say, that albeit this dissembling hypocrite, being here sore plunged, seemeth by his silence to take in good part Pope *Leo*, as also Pope *Gelasius* their exclamation, and deserued execration against halfe Communions; yet still subtillie like himselfe, being as false as a foxe, he would faine make fooles beleeue (thereby to deserue his fathers blessing) that the Communion in those daies was ministred vnder both kindes, by vertue onely of a dispensation from Prelates. Now, if there were any sparke of shame, or hatred of lying in him, hee would not in this point thus face out a falshood; considering how plainly it is prooued by calling two Popes to witnesse, that to minister the Communion at any time vnder one kinde, is a thing altogether vnlawfull and sacrilegious. And besides, we know, and all Popish Catholikes (being not wilfully blinded) may vnderstand, that to plead dispensatiõs, as here & oftẽtimes in the like case they are boldly vrged, is nothing else but such a shameless shift to deceiue Gods people, as that *Franciscus à Victoria*, a learned Frier, and of great credit among the Papists, thus declaimeth against them: *Videmus quotidiè à Romana curia tam largas, imò omnino tam dissolutas dispensationes profectas, vt orbis ferre non possit; non solùm in*

See their testimonies, and note thẽ well.

scandalum pusillorũ, sed maiorum: that is, We see daily so large, yea, altogether so dissolute dispensations, come from the Court of *Rome*, that the world cannot endure it; neither is that to the scandall of the weake onely, but euen of the perfect sort.

Papist. *This Minister lyeth, in saying this custome, To receiue vnder one kinde, to haue been begun in the Councell of* Constance, *so many hundreth yeares after Christ. For that Councell, onely against some fire-brands of hell, that began to impugne the generall custome of Gods people in communicating vnder one kinde, did commend that custome to be Catholike; and decreed, that it being so long obserued, should bee taken for a lawe, which might not be reiected at euerie mans pleasure, vvithout the authoritie of the Church.*

Protestant. Beholde howe a lyar, more impudent than impudencie it selfe, heere giueth mee the lie; euen against his owne conscience and knowledge, if he haue either conscience or learning. For, who knoweth not (as, in my former treatise I auowed, and will still maintaine) that the Communion vnder both kindes was administred diligently, in the Christian world, without hauing any decree or commandement to the contrary, vntill in the late Councell of *Constance?* Yea, and howsoeuer my Aduersarie boldly pleadeth, without blushing (for his face is of brasse) that Gods people in former times cõmunicated generally vnder one kinde: yet *è contra*, notwithstanding, I rest readie to prooue by plaine testimonies of the holy ancient Fathers (least he abuse himselfe, and others vnder the vizard of Antiquitie) that the vniuersall Church followed, many hundred yeres together, and religiously obserued Christs precept in communicating vnder both kindes. For, *How with such hands* (saith *Ambrose* vnto *Theodosius* the Emperour) *vvilt thou take the Lords holy body? how darest thou drinke of the Cup of his precious bloud?* These words prooue, that the Temporality, in this holy Fathers time, receiued the Sacrament in both kinds, and that in their hands. Saint *Hierome* saith, *Priests, which doe consecrate the Sacrament, deliuer the blood of Christ to the people.* Saint *Chrysostome* also obserued in his time this precept, at *Constantinople. For,* (saith he) *the Priest doth not eat one part, & the Laitie*

Saint Ambrose.

Hierom. cap. 2. Ma.

Chrysost. 2. ad Cor. cap. 9.

tie another part, after the manner of the old Law: but vnto all is distributed one bodie, and one Cup. Ignatius saith, *There is but one flesh of the Lord Iesu, and one blood that was shed for vs: there is also but one Bread that is broken for all; and one Cup that is distributed among all.* Cyprian: *How doe we prepare the people for the Cup of Martyrdome, if wee doe not first admit them to drinke the Lords Cup by right of Communion?* Augustine: *Not onely no man is forbidden, but rather all men that seeke for life are encouraged to drinke.* And againe, speaking to the people, *Simul bibimus* (saith he) *quia simul viuimus: We drinke together* (at the Lords Table) *because we liue together.* Ignat. ad Philad. anno salutis 100. Cypr. lib. 1. Epist 2. anno 200 August. quæst. super Leuiticum lib. 3. cap. 57.

Tertullian saith: *By the Sacrament of Bread and of the Cup, we haue prooued in the Gospell the veritie of the bodie, and of the bloud of our Lord, against the fantasticall dreames of* Marcion. And in another place, speaking of the woman which was married to an infidell, saith: *At whose hand shall she desire, viz. the Sacrament of Bread? with whom shal she participate of the Cup?* that is, *The Sacrament of Wine? Origen* saith: *The faithfull do eat, in the bread, the body of Christ: they drinke, in the wine, his bloud. For, so said our Lord vnto his Disciples: Take and eat, take and drinke, &c. and he would not that either the one or the other should bee reserued for the next day, &c.* Lib. 5. aduer. Marcionem Tertul. ad vxorem lib. 2.

Iustinus Martyr is yet more plaine: *After the Pastor hath giuen thanks, & after the blessing of al the people, the Deacons gaue vnto euery one of those that were present, a piece of Bread, and of the Cup, delayed vvith water; by vvhich is administred the Sacrament of thankesgiuing.* By all which, and many such like testimonies, it euidently appeareth, that this restraint of the Cup, could not be either in the first or second age; but was brought into the Church many hundred yeeres after Christ. Yea, *Gregorie*, surnamed the great, after whose time sincere doctrine begunne to decay, witnesseth, that this custome of communicating vnder both kindes, was kept in the Romane Church in his daies, saying: *You haue learned what the bloud of the Lambe is, not by heare-say, but by drinking it.* And *Gelasius*, Bishop of *Rome*, made a Decree fiue hundred yeres after *Gregory* his death, for the confirmation of this custome, because then some presumed to receiue vnder one kinde. Neither can it bee prooued, that the Laitie Iust. Mart. Apol. 2. Gregory. Gelasius. 1118.

were

Fred. Barbarossa. 1160.

were restrained from the Cup of Christ before the raigne of *Frederike* the first, surnamed *Barbarossa*. To which restraint, notwithstanding, the Orientall Church would neuer consent, but vsed both kindes alwaies. Behold therefore, O behold and wonder, in that the Church of *Rome* hath taken vpon her to forbid that, which Christ commanded, that which the Apostles followed, and that which the vniuersall Church obserued from time to time, as is declared.

Papist. *Now surely, I neuer thought to haue heard of any beast so long eared, or so void of reason, as that durst lay to* Gerson, *and the other learned men in that Councels charge, the alteration of Christs institution vpon any reasons, much lesse vpon so bald a one as this Minister brings, of the length of mens beards*; Gersons *bookes yet testifiing to the world his great pietie, wisedome, and learning.*

Protest. My Aduersarie, in stead of blasting my reputation, hath here blazed indeede his owne shame. For, it is a stranger thing, and passing all sense and reason, that any Student, of *Brazen face Colledge*, durst for his eares (being not altogether an Asse without vnderstanding) thus controwle mee, in laying to *Gerson* his charge and others, the alteration of Christs Institution, vpon any reasons. For if this impudent fresh-man will but looke better on his bookes, hee shall plainely perceiue, that *Alphonsus de Castro*, and *Iohn Gerson*, in defence of their halfe Communion, taught, and as it were forced the poore people (contrarie to the expresse word of Christ, contrary to the example of the Apostles, and all the holy Fathers in the primitiue Church, and contrarie to the generall vse and order of many hundred yeares) to giue eare to their trim arguments, and reasons thus laid out, and more at large also: *The costlinesse of wine, the fouling of the Cups, the turning of the wine into vineger, the engendring of flyes, the trouble of mens beards, &c.*

Alphons. aduersus Hær. lib. 6 de Eucharist. Sect. vltima.

Iohn Gerson de Communione Laicor.

Whereupon iudge, I pray you, O ye Papists: and if you will iudge vprightly, how iniuriously this beardlesse companion (for how else can he receiue the Cup of saluation?) hath dealt with me, you cannot but wonder, that so dissolute, and desperat a caitiffe durst take vpon him, with open mouth, thus to bark, and

and to raile without shame, against the trueth. For, besides the verification in this sort of my former assertion, let mee further tell you, that in the late Councell at *Trident*, it was thus concluded: *Si quis dixerit sanctam ecclesiam catholicam non iustis causis & rationibus adductam fuisse, &c. If any man shall say, that the holy Catholike Church, without iust causes and reasons her mooving, doth communicate both the Laitie, and also Priests vnlesse they minister, vnder the one forme of bread,* or that the Church hath erred in the same, *Anathema sit, let him be accursed.* Concil. Trident. de Com. sub vna specie. can. 2.

Whereupon *Tertullian* writeth very aptly; *Credunt sine scripturis, vt credant contra scripturas: they beleeue without the scriptures, that they may beleeue against the scriptures.* Tertul. de præscriptione.

Papist. *Consider therefore, I pray you, that seeing trueth cannot be found amongst such wretches as these Ministers are, that dare not onely lye in such matters of weight, but publish them to the sight of the world; If you desire to know the truth, you must returne to the catholike Church, which* Zacharie *calleth the Citie of truth: in which you shall finde this heauenly* Manna, *this foode of life, hauing all delight in it, Christ himselfe; who is the way of holy conuersation, the truth of celestiall doctrine, and the life of eternall blisse.* The Church of Rome is rather a sinke of all abhomination, than a storehouse of heauenly foode.

Protestant. Lastly, abusing the people to whom hee wrote, to their damnation, like a craftie seducer hee thus concludeth: *Seeing truth cannot be found amongst such vvretches as these Ministers are, that dare not onely lie in such matters, but publish them to the light of the world; if you desire to know the truth, you must returne to the catholike Church: in which you shall finde this heauenly Manna, this food of life, &c.*

Although this comparison beseemeth well the rest of his courteous eloquence: yet an euill cause is neuer the better for so good a cloake: and an ill matter is neuer amended by good words. And therefore I may iustly turne ouer that craft of the Diuell vpon him, in vsing so holy-like an exhortation to so euil a purpose. For, as the subtill Serpent pretended great kindenesse to our first Parents, in counselling them to eat of the forbidden fruit, that so they might see and be as Gods, but therein intended their euerlasting destruction; so likewise, this and o-

ther like crafty Foxes of the Antichristian crew, doe seeme to be charitable persons, and to giue good counsell whersoeuer they come: but yet *they deuoure vvidowes houses, and that vnder colour of long prayers.*

If you desire (saith this seditious Calumniator) to know the truth, you must return (and so say we) to the Catholike Church. Now, hee meaneth not to that Church which is builded vpon the doctrine of the Prophets and Apostles, where GODs trueth is sincerely professed, where his Sacraments are rightly administred, and where his Name is called vpon, by hearty, zealous, and deuout prayer: but hee meaneth, to the Church Antichristian, where the Popes Doctors, and Proctours keepe not (as alreadie hath beene prooued) the Lords Institution, but their owne: where they doe not as the Lord hath prescribed, but as themselues haue deuised: & where not like Saints, but theeues, they leaue no means vnattempted, whereby the hearts of vnstable fooles may any way bee seduced. Now, Lord, what peruersitie (shall I say) or ignorance, or impudence is it, thus to preferre dreames, fansies, lyes, and fables, before the heauenly doctrine of Gods euerlasting trueth! For, wee seeke not Christ as they doe, in mens traditions and vnwritten verities; but in the written veritie of GODs word. Wee are carefull to traine men vp in the knowledge of CHRIST, which is eternall life; in true godlinesse, which is profitable vnto all things, which hath the promise of the life present, and of that which is to come: but they feede mens eyes with all glorious and glittering shewes: they inuent to themselues Instruments of Musicke, to delight the eare: but of the worke of the Lord, of preaching the Gospell, of instructing the heart, they little respect or regard: and surely no maruell. For, if they passe the dayes of their life lewdly, after death at a reasonable rate they may purchase rest for their soules: Yea, if their hearts bee set vpon adulterie, incest, theft, murther, let but the holy Father be considered for his parchment and lead, and what more easily granted in the Court of *Rome*, than full and free libertie to commit sinne? *Omnia venalia Romæ*. So that men need no more looke vp to heauen, but down into their purses, to finde Pardons. From whence it commeth to passe, that as euery

The whorish church of *Rome* hath all things for the body, but nothing for the soule.

euerie man is most licentiously bent, so he ioyneth himselfe most willingly to that whorish and Babilonical Strumpet, the Church of *Rome*, and warreth most earnestly for that faith. It were too much to recite all the meanes whereby that kingdome of darknesse hath growne: it were a thing too full of horrour, to discourse of all the treacheries, poysonings, murtherings, and massacres, which they haue vsed, to maintaine their power. Did Christ, did *Peter*, did the blessed Apostles thus subdue and conquer nations? did they thus enlarge the kingdome of God? Verily, and as surely as the Lord liueth, it is not the goodnesse of their Religion, but the strength of their faction, and the wilinesse of flesh, by which they stand. Wherefore to conclude this matter, I haue as you see (O ye silly Papists) set before you, according to promise, a manifest difference between Christ and Antichrist, the doctrine of God, and the learning of man, true teachers and false, and betweene sound and counterfaited Religion. If therefore you tender the saluation of your owne soules, and be led with any hope of the life to come, be not as children, readie to take whatsoeuer is offered: but learne to iudge betweene good and euill. Especially, take heede and beware of such false Teachers and crafty seducers, as speake good of euill, and euill of good; of such as put light for darknesse, and darknesse for light; and of such as iustifie the wicked for a reward, and take away the righteousnesse of the righteous from him: that so, embracing the sound and wholesome Doctrine deliuered in the word of God, and abhorring the superstitious Ceremonies of mens deuises, ye may seeke and serue the Lord where he may be found, to his great glorie, and your safetie in this life, and eternall saluation in the world to come.

FINIS.

6990a

HH 70/34
6990a
Dodson, Thomas